DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 453 EA 010 270

AUTHOR Ellett, Chad D.
TITLE Understanding and Using the Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS).
INSTITUTION Utah Univ., Salt Lake City. Dept. of Educational Administration.
PUB DATE Feb 78
NOTE 14p.; For a related document, see EA 010 109
JOURNAL CIT CCBC Notebook; v7 n2 pp2-14 Feb 1978

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Measurement Instruments; Needs Assessment; Performance Factors; Preservice Education; *Principals; Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *Georgia Principal Assessment System; Results Oriented Management in Education

ABSTRACT

The Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS) is a set of practically administered instruments and procedures for assessing performances of school principals. The instruments and procedures were developed over a four-year period of Project Results Oriented Management in Education (Project RCME) at the University of Georgia. Each of the instruments contains statements of principal performance that have been validated through large-scale research in Georgia. This document provides a brief description of the GPAS and its developmental history, its administration and scoring procedures, and potential school uses of the instruments. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149453

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Univ. of Utah
Dept. of Ed. Admin.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

UNDERSTANDING AND USING THE GEORGIA PRINCIPAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (GPAS)

Chad D. Ellett, University of Georgia

(In the Fall issue, Chad reported the R & D effort underlying teacher assessment of principal performance. In this article he reports on the total assessment system. This report is not only a description of the instruments and procedures but an excellent description of sound R & D. Ed.)

The Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS) is a set of practically administered instruments and procedures for assessing performances (behaviors) of school principals. The instruments and procedures were developed over a four-year

EA 010 270

period of Project R.O.M.E. (Results Oriented Management in Education) assessment staff within the College of Education at the University of Georgia. The GPAS has been field tested in 120 elementary and secondary schools in the State of Georgia to establish the useability of the instruments in meeting local school assessment and evaluation needs, and in order to select instrument items having known relationships to other school characteristics of educational importance. The field testing and developmental work involved the cooperation of, and contributions from, approximately 18,000 students. 4,500 teachers, 500 principals and school administrators, 20 to 25 school systems, numerous central office personnel, the individuals at the Georgia State Department of Education, the University of Georgia, the Valdosta State College. Descriptions of the developmental work that went into designing and field testing the GPAS instruments comprise some 1,200 pages to date, and are only briefly reviewed here.

The effort to produce the GPAS was fostered by the Georgia State Department of Education's Division of Program and Staff Development and the Thomas County, Georgia Board of Education's interest in making a critical examination of principals' behaviors in the school setting, and in developing simple but useful measures of these. The procedures used in developing the GPAS instruments included a maximum input from practicing school administrators who both helped develop and made critical judgments about the importance of the instrument items (performance statements) for the effective operation of a school.

This document provides a brief description of the GPAS and its developmental history, its administration and scoring procedures, and potential school uses of the instruments. It is non-technical in nature, and those desiring more detailed information about characteristics of the various instruments are referred to the separate technical manuals available for each instrument, and the II R.O.M.E. assessment reports and various research papers produced to date.

OVERVIEW OF INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES AND THE GEORGIA PRINCIPAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (GPAS)

The Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS) began in 1974 with an initial identification and development of competency statements for school principals from several sources: reviews of the professional literature in educational administration, objectives-based workshops with principals themselves, on-the-job observations of principals' performances in real school settings, and a task for operationalizing critical educational goals for Georgia. These efforts identified approximately 3,500 to 4,000 statements of principals' various duties, roles, responsibilities, functions, and competencies. This large number of job-related descriptions was reduced to a more manageable and inclusive set of performance statements (306) that reflected input from the variety of sources used in their identification and development.

A classification system was developed for the 306 competency statements that reflected seven traditional Functional Areas of Administrative Responsibility associated with the principalship (Curriculum and Instruction, Staff Personnel, Pupil Personnel, Support Management, School-Community Interface, Fiscal Management, and System-wide Policies and Operations), and six Administrative Operations (Collecting Information, Planning, Communicating, Decision-Making, Implementing, and Evaluating), all processes in the traditional school

management cycle. Each of the 306 performance statements for principals was classified by both the Administrative Operation and Functional Area reflected in each statement. An example of a principal performance statement reflecting the Functional Area of Curriculum and Instruction and the Administrative Operation of Evaluating is given below:

"PERIODICALLY ASSESSES THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TEACHING METHODS"

A statewide content verification survey was undertaken in the State of Georgia during 1974 using practicing school principals, competency-based education experts, and state department of education and central office personnel to reduce the 306 performance statements to a more manageable, high-priority set. One hundred and fifty-five participants in the survey made judgments about the 306 statements and selected those most "frequently important" for the effective operation of a successful school. This process reduced the 306 statements to a high-priority set of 80 competencies for principals judged to be frequently important for the effective operation of a school.

A second step in developing the GPAS was the generation of performance indicators for each of the 80 verified competency statements. In a workshop setting, 30 to 35 principals developed performance indicators for each of the 80 competencies by simply stating what they would do in carrying out the competencies in a successful (ideal) school. R.O.M.E. assessment staff at the University of Georgia developed additional indicators for the 80 competencies which when added to those developed by principals themselves, produced 885 indicators for the 80 competencies.

In order to develop and field test assessment instruments, this large number of indicators (885) had to be reduced. Therefore, a second statewide verification survey was undertaken during 1974-1975 with approximately 300 principals in the state. These participants were asked to identify which indicators were essential for the effective operation of a school. Using the results of this survey, R.O.M.E. staff selected 338 performance indicators for developing first forms of the Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS). The indicators were assigned to appropriate data sources for assessment purposes, and a field test and validation model was designed.

After the 338 items had been classified according to the appropriate assessment source, several forms of the Principal Performance Description Survey (PPDS) instruments emerged. These instruments were field tested in 45 schools (10 secondary and 35 elementary) in the State of Georgia during the Spring of 1975 to provide data for the validation of the competencies and for instruments revision.

As the R.O.M.E. project continued during 1976, a second set of 273 competency indicators was assigned to appropriate instruments and field tested in an additional 60 schools (1976-1977). To date, forms of the various instruments have been field tested in approximately 120 public schools in the State of Georgia, and have been used to provide information for, and to evaluate a field-based training program for principals administered through Valdosta State College.

Having conducted two major field tests of the various PPDS instruments, final items were selected during 1977 for each of the PPDS instruments using three basic considerations. First, items were selected that were demonstrated

through past R.O.M.E. research to be related to other factors of importance in the school setting (e.g., teacher morale factors, students' perceptions of school climate/learning environment characteristics, school achievement, and school attendance). Secondly, items were selected that had meaningful content for the operation of a school and the purposes for which the instruments were designed. Thirdly, consideration was given to the original items deemed essential for effective school operation by principals themselves, and to the practicality of final instrument length. The most important of these considerations was selecting valid items...items having known relationships to other meaningful factors in the educational setting. Thus, each of the various PPDS instruments contains statements of principal performance (competencies) that have been validated through large-scale research in the State of Georgia, a unique and important assessment instrument characteristic.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE DESCRIPTION SURVEY (PPDS) INSTRUMENTS

In developing rating scales for the various instruments comprising the Principal Performance Description Survey (PPDS), two dimensions of a principal's performance were selected. The first of these was the frequency dimension, or "how often" a principal is viewed as performing a certain activity in the school. The second dimension was effectiveness of performance, or "how well" a principal is viewed as performing activities in the school. Research with the R.O.M.E. field test data has demonstrated that both of these rating dimensions are valid for assessing principals' performances reflected on the various PPDS instruments. As mentioned in later sections of this manual, however, the meaning of particular ratings for any principal should be considered in view of both local system and school expectations, and the variety of job requirements of the principalship. The sections that follow provide a brief description of the various PPDS instruments and their administration, scoring and response formats. A more detailed description can be found in the separate technical manuals for each instrument.

1. The Principal Performance Description Survey (PPDS) - Principal Form

The PPDS - Principal Form instrument consists of 100 statements of principal performance (behaviors) to be responded to by principals themselves. Scores on the instrument represent a principal's self-perception of "how often" and "how well" he/she performs selected job-related tasks. Two ratings are provided for each instrument item: Frequency With Which I Perform Task...from 1--NEVER to 5--VERY OFTEN, and Effectiveness With Which I Perform Task...from 1--INEFFECTIVE to 5--VERY EFFECTIVE. The instrument has a separate answer and scoring sheet, and requires approximately 30 minutes to complete.

The instrument yields scores in five Functional Areas of Administrative Responsibility: Curriculum and Instruction, Staff Personnel, Pupil Personnel, Fiscal Management, and System-wide Policies and Operations. The first 64 items on the instrument yield scores that can be compared to teachers' assessments of their principal's performance. The next 36 items yield scores to be compared to assessments by an external observer/interviewer. Or, the entire 100 items can be combined for a global self-assessment to be compared to normative data for the instrument. Instrument instructions allow principals to build and plot their own performance profiles for each of the instrument subscores and for

each part of the instrument. These profiles can be compared to other principals' self-assessments, assessments by teachers, normative profiles, or assessments by an external observer, all part of the larger GPAS.

II. The Principal Performance Description Survey (PPDS) - Teacher Form

The PPDS - Teacher Form instrument consists of 64 statements of principals' performance deemed appropriate for assessment by teachers. The instrument can be administered to all teachers within a school, or on a sampling basis. Like the PPDS - Principal Form, teachers provide two ratings for each instrument item: Frequency With Which Principal Performs Task...from 1--NEVER to 5--VERY OFTEN, and Effectiveness With Which Principal Performs Task...from 1--INEFFECTIVE to 5--VERY EFFECTIVE. The instrument is designed to assess teacher opinions of how often and how well their principal performs selected school-related activities.

Scores are provided in four Functional Areas of Administrative Responsibility: Curriculum and Instruction, Staff Personnel, Pupil Personnel, and System-wide Policies and Operations. A separate answer sheet is provided, and teachers can take and score the complete instrument in approximately 30 minutes. Scores for all teachers in a school are summarized by a school data collector and given to the principal on an anonymous basis to be used in building a performance profile. This teacher profile can be compared to a normative or self-assessment profile by the school principal. Of all instruments comprising the GPAS, the PPDS - Teacher Form instrument scores have been demonstrated through field testing to be the most valid.

III. The Principal Performance Description Survey - External Observer Form

The PPDS - External Observer (EO) Form instrument consists of 36 statements of principal performance which are assessed through a structured interview with the principal by a trained observer/interviewer. The scoring system for the instrument is based on the idea that performances (behaviors) in the school produce certain kinds of tangible, observable "evidence" by which the quality of performance can be assessed. The PPDS - EO instrument requires the use of a trained assessor, but does have a training manual that makes it still useful for local school assessment. Administration and scoring procedures and limitations concerning the nature of the instrument are included in the separate training materials and manual. Items on the PPDS - EO instrument are scored on a four-point scale ranging from 0--NOT APPLICABLE to 4--PRODUCT. The instrument yields subscale scores for five Functional Areas of Administrative Responsibility: Curriculum and Instruction, Staff Personnel, Pupil Personnel, Fiscal Management, and System-wide Policies and Operations. Scores are plotted by the principal to build a performance profile to be compared to a normative plot, and to his/her own self-assessments.

IV. The PPDS - Superintendent Form

The PPDS - Superintendent Form is a series of 42 performance dimensions

rated with a 6-point scale from 1--EXTREMELY INEFFECTIVE to 6--EXTREMELY EFFECTIVE. It is completed by the local system superintendent or other members of the central office staff having knowledge of the particular performances reflected in the performance dimensions to be rated. The performance dimensions are based on 7 Functional Areas and 6 Administrative Operations classifications, and ratings are provided for each Administrative Operation by Functional Area of Administrative Responsibility. For example, in the Functional Area of Curriculum and Instruction, one rating each is supplied for how effectively the principal Collects Information, Plans, Communicates, Makes Decisions, Implements, and Evaluates. These same ratings are applied to the other six Functional Area performance categories. The instrument is hand-scored and yields subscores for each of seven Functional Areas and six Administrative Operations. Performance profiles can be built from the assessment scores to be compared to system and R.O.M.E. norms. Special uses and limitations of the PPDS - Superintendent Form are specified in the instrument's technical manual.

The GPAS thus consists of 4 different forms of the Principal Performance Description Survey (PPDS) instruments, completed by four different assessment sources: principals themselves, teachers, an external observer, and the superintendent or other central office personnel. Ideally all instruments in the GPAS should be administered to collect as much information about principals' performances as possible from a variety of assessment sources. However, separate instruments in the GPAS can be selected to meet individual school and system needs. Some suggestions for instruments in the GPAS to fit school assessment needs are discussed more fully in the sections that follow.

SUGGESTED USES OF INSTRUMENTS IN THE GEORGIA PRINCIPAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (GPAS)*

The various instruments comprising the GPAS can be used to fulfill a variety of school assessment needs and programs. The emphasis in conducting an assessment with the instruments is on the performance of building level principals, and in certain cases, pre-service administrators. Since the items selected for the instruments have been demonstrated to have adequate validity (i.e., have known relationships to teacher morale factors, students' assessments of characteristics of the school climate/learning environment, and school achievement and attendance), assessment information yielded by the instruments is suggestive of areas in which principals might improve their performance to more likely have an impact on school outcomes. At both the in-service and pre-service levels, assessment with particular GPAS instruments can be useful in pointing out performance deficits around which training goals can be structured to hopefully lead to skill and performance improvement. Users should keep in mind that the GPAS instruments were designed to provide an assessment of selected principal performances by a variety of sources. They were not designed to render any final "evaluation" of how well principals do their job. Nor were they designed to distinguish between "good," "bad," and "mediocre" principals. As with other school personnel, a comprehensive "evaluation" of principals requires many different kinds of information from many different sources before these judgments can be made. The sections that follow in this document provide some

*A separate assessment document is in preparation that shows how performance profiles from the separate PPDS instruments are compared and how assessment information can be translated into "action plans" for school principals.

general suggestions concerning possible uses of assessment information yielded by the various instruments in the GPAS, as well as some general cautions concerning different aspects of performance assessment.

General Performance Appraisal

Instruments in the GPAS can be used for the general performance appraisal of principals on-the-job. As with other types of assessment instruments available, any data yielded by the various PPDS instruments is limited by the instrument items themselves. For example, if a principal attains a given score in the Functional Area of Curriculum and Instruction on the PPDS - Teacher Form, one needs to keep in mind that the score is based solely on those items making up that particular subscale. Since the items on the PPDS instruments represent only a sample of possible performances in any given Functional Area, users should be cautious in making "evaluative" judgments about the quality of a principal's work. The scores can be, however, suggestive of performance areas needing improvement when compared to both the system and the larger R.O.M.E. norms. Assessment discrepancies apparent when principals compare their self-assessments to those by their teachers are another primary source of performance appraisal information.

When administering the PPDS instruments for general performance appraisal purposes, systems and schools might best proceed by first considering which informational source about the principal's performance is of most importance. That is, if one is most interested in the perceptions of teachers, then administration of the PPDS - Teacher Form would probably become a priority. If potential users are most interested in the formality with which principals perform on the job, then administration of the PPDS - External Observer (EO) Form might be in order. Ideally, all PPDS instruments should be administered to obtain the maximum amount of information from a variety of assessment sources.

One suggested strategy for performance appraisal is to administer the GPAS at the beginning of the school year to identify performance goals for individual principals or all principals in a particular system. If, for example, a Fall assessment shows that principals achieve their lowest scores in the Functional Area of Staff Personnel, then the Staff Personnel items can be reviewed, and work in this area might become a system-wide priority. Data from follow-up assessments during the school year can then be compared to previous assessments to measure performance improvement. If personnel in a given system agree that particular performance areas assessed by the various PPDS instruments reasonably fit their conception of the principal's job responsibilities, then performance standards might be set using the instruments from one year to the next. A performance priority for a system might be, for example, to have all principals in the system attain at least 50% of the maximum possible score in selected Functional Areas deemed important by the system, and to maintain this performance level from one year to the next.

Needs Assessment and Staff Development

Past experience with the Georgia Principal Assessment System indicates that it can be a useful addition to school system plans for staff development activities based on needs assessment information. Since one of the State Department of Education requirements for approved staff development plans is evidence of evaluation activities and effectiveness/success, instrumentation in the GPAS can be used to identify performance needs and monitor improvement activities

implemented for school principals during the course of staff development activities.

Most school needs assessments are based on accumulating information from a variety of sources (e.g., students, teachers, community, etc.) to set system priorities and educational goals. A variety of needs assessment methods are available, but most results of needs assessments represent summary opinions of "what the schools should be doing or working toward." They frequently do not get more directly at an examination of on-the-job performance as a basis for the identification of school needs, and thus are one step removed from the school setting where actual performance occurs. Administration of the various PPDS instruments can be considered an on-the-job assessment of principals' performances that generates information pointing out performance "needs" in a variety of areas, and from a variety of sources. For systems developing comprehensive needs assessment/staff development plans, the GPAS can be effectively used to identify performance needs and in-service training objectives for principals, at both the system and building level.

It is suggested that data summaries based on a GPAS assessment can be totaled for all principals in a particular system to identify system-level performance priorities from which training goals can be developed. In addition, each individual principal could select particular performance areas for improvement based on the data from his individual school assessment. This can be easily done by comparing scores within or between the different PPDS instruments, or by comparing individual scores for individual principals to system norms produced by a system-wide assessment.

The place of the GPAS in staff development plans is best viewed as a means of identifying critical performance areas needing improvement, and of structuring specific staff development (training) goals based on the assessment information. Such staff development plans with principals have obvious advantages over the many attempts to identify what school principals need through the "armchair opinion" approach. Among these is the collection of information about valid job-related performances from a variety of different sources...a true data-based approach to planning staff development activities for administrators.

Once an assessment has occurred with all or some of the instruments in the GPAS, "action plans" can be constructed by looking at individual and system assessment scores. Individual performance statements on which these scores are based can be examined and interpreted within the context of the broader goals of the school system. Action plans (training goals and procedures) can then be derived from the performance statements themselves.

For example, suppose an individual principal's assessment in the Fall demonstrated that he was rated as <u>infrequently</u> and <u>ineffectively</u> carrying out the following performance in the <u>Staff Personnel</u> Functional Area: <u>Participates in professional improvement activities with teachers.</u> Working with staff development leaders, the individual principal could operationalize the meaning of the performance in his school and begin to structure activities in which he will participate during the year to improve his performance in <u>professional improvement activities with teachers</u>. He/she might, for example, decide on methods of communicating professional association information to teachers, on making certain to announce and discuss this information at all faculty meetings, on scheduling visitations with selected teachers to other schools running

exemplary programs in different curriculum areas, etc. These efforts would become part of the individual principal's "action plan" to improve his performance in the Area of Staff Personnel. Similarly, actions plans acould be written based on assessment information for all principals in the system combined, in any general performance area viewed by the system as less than optimal.

Individual schools and school systems will need to be innovative in their approaches to using information based on an assessment with the PPDS instruments, since no standardized procedures in using the instruments to meet local school staff development objectives are available. The absence of structured "action plans" to fit different PPDS assessments is probably a good feature in the sense that local schools can interpret assessment information in view of their own system needs and staff development objectives. A small, rural school system, for example, having principals scoring low in the area of staff personnel, might decide to develop specific performance improvement activities that would be bastly different from those developed for a large urban school system because of the way the principalship with its variety of duties and responsibilities is viewed.

Pre-Service Applications

Individual items (performance statements) on the various PPDS instruments were developed using a maximum of input from practicing school principals. Principals themselves provided judgments about the importance of the various items for the effective operation of a school program at several stages in the larger R.O.M.E. project. Thus, the items logically have the most utility for principals inservice. However, certain PPDS instruments might be used with "pre-service" principals in developing educational objectives and in evaluating educational progress.

One suggested approach to using the PPDS instruments at the pre-service level is to allow students entering educational programs in administration to conduct a "self-assessment" with the instruments to identify areas in which they feel their performance needs to be improved. An individual student, for example, could take items on the PPDS - Principal or PPDS - Teacher Forms and rate the extent to which he/she feels they possess the requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities to carry out the performances in a real school setting. This self-assessment could then be used as an aid in selecting specific courses and training programs during the pre-service educational experience more likely to improve performance skills on the job. The student, having completed a self-assessment with the PPDS instruments might discuss the results with a faculty advisor in planning his educational program and course sequence leading to a higher degree or certification level. This approach to pre-service use of the GPAS instruments serves as a student's "needs" assessment on a set of performances that practicing school principals have judged as important and job-related--and that research has demonstrated to be related to important school outcomes.

At various points in a pre-service educational program, student advisors (faculty members) might use the PPDS instruments to assess students' progress. For example, one could review the various PPDS instrument items and make professional judgments concerning whether the student has mastered the knowledges and skills necessary to implement all, or some set of, performances once employed in a school setting. If the judgment is a negative one, then specific

remedial experiences might be discussed with, and designed for, the pre-service student to raise his performance level and to fulfill his perceived needs.

Another strategy for pre-service use of the instruments would be to compare supervisors' (faculty members) ratings and students' ratings. Students' self-assessments in various Functional Areas (e.g., Curriculum and Instruction skills) could be compared to those of their supervisors (faculty members) at various points in the pre-service training experience and discussed. Hopefully greater agreement between advisor and student would be seen as the student progressed through the pre-service program. Again, pre-service use of the PPDS instruments requires considerable innovation on the part of those using them, since no exact methods have yet been designed. However, their use at the pre-service level seems reasonable, since the items on the instruments have been judged as job-related and important for the effective operation of a school by a large sample of practicing school principals.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS IN ADMINISTERING THE GEORGIA PRINCIPAL ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (GPAS)

This section of the manual provides the reader with several general considerations to be kept in mind when administering the variety of instruments in the GPAS. The most important of these is the basic purpose for which the instruments were designed and the philosophy on which an "assessment" is based. As mentioned in other parts of this manual, the GPAS instruments were designed to be practically administered and scored, and to validly and reliably measure sets of performances of school principals known to be related to other important factors in the school. Critical to the development of the items on the instruments were judgment about their importance by practicing school principals. Any individual principal undergoing an assessment with the GPAS, is thus being assessed on sets of performances seen as important for effective school operation by his/her peers. The GPAS was not developed to "evaluate" whether a principal is doing a "good" or "bad" job, a judgment that requires many different perspectives and many kinds of information, and it should not be used in making such judgments. However, the GPAS provides important and useable information from which school improvement and self improvement activities can be developed and monitored. Any information yielded by an assessment with the instruments should be interpreted and used only in view of the general goals, needs, educational philosophy, etc. within a given school and/or school system. Since the definition of the principalship and the job roles of principals change considerably from one system to the next, this point is important to remember.

How Should The Decision For Assessment Be Made?

During the three year field test of the GPAS in some 120 elementary and secondary schools in the State of Georgia, much has been learned about the "evaluation apprehension" that principals sometimes feel when assessment is discussed. School systems can best alleviate this apprehension by being certain that the purpose of administering the GPAS is to provide information for performance improvement, not for performance evaluation. This has been successfully done at many system level meetings attended by both key central office personnel and principals themselves. The decision to be assessed is best made by principals themselves, once they have enough information about what the assessment is for, and how the information will be used. Our experience has been that principals will view the assessment as both meaningful and useful if they know the assessment information is to be used in "non-evaluative" ways by system level personnel. The best approach has been to explain

to any principal being assessed that information derived from his school belongs to him, and is to be shared with others in the system only at his/her discretion. When assessment guidelines are followed, principals can provide system level personnel with assessment information to be combined to establish system norms, and still remain anonymous. General instructions for the various PPDS instruments explain for the principal how this is accomplished.

Can Teacher Anonymity Be Maintained?

Administration instructions for the PPDS - Teacher Form instrument are designed to protect the anonymity of individual teachers in a given school. Since the interest in a school is on teachers' collective responses as a group, it is not necessary to identify individuals providing assessment information about a principal's performance. Teachers are instructed when taking the PPDS - Teacher Form instrument how to score their responses. These, in turn, are given to a designated school data collector on an anonymous basis to be summarized for the school principal. A short document for school data collectors explains how to maintain teacher anonymity and to score response to the PPDS - Teacher Form instrument.

How Are Teachers Selected to Participate in the Assessment?

Since an assessment with instruments in the GPAS seeks to maximize information about principals' performances from a variety of perspectives, it is suggested that all teachers in a school participate. Like soliciting the cooperation of principals in the assessment, maximum teacher participation probably comes about when teachers are asked to participate on a voluntary basis, and when they understand that the purpose of the assessment is performance improvement--not evaluation. They should be assured by the school principal and system that their anonymity will be maintained at all times. Specific instructions on the PPDS - Teacher Form describe how teachers are to respond to the instrument, and how the instrument is to be scored. In addition, teachers are asked to turn in their answer sheets to a "neutral" person in the school or system (e.g., the school librarian) so that data for all teachers in a school can be combined for the principal's use.

How Are The Instruments Scored?

Each of the Principal Performance Description Survey (PPDS) instruments in the Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS) can be easily scored by hand by individuals responding to the instrument. The PPDS instruments for the principal and for teachers are simply scored by adding frequency and effectiveness ratings for instrument items coded by Functional Area of Administrative Responsibility (i.e., Curriculum and Instruction, Staff Personnel, etc.). These scores are then plotted on performance profile sheets in order to pictorially display what a principal's assessment "looks like." These graphs can then be compared to both system norms and the larger R.O.M.E. norm derived from the Georgia statewide field test of the instruments.

The PPDS - Superintendent Form is also hand scored by the appropriate central office personnel completing it, and a profile for each principal is plotted that allows for a comparison of Functional Areas ofAdministrative Responsibility and Administrative Operations subscores. Instructions for this instrument also show how system norms are to be computed and displayed.

Where Can the GPAS Instruments Be Obtained?

The various forms of the Principal Performance Description Survey may be obtained by contacting one of the following R.O.M.E. representatives:

Dr. Chad D. Ellett
Project R.O.M.E.
228 Fain Hall
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30602

Mr. John R. Clark
Director, ESEA,
Title III
Thomas Co. Schools
P. O. Box 440
Thomasville, Georgia
31792

Dr. Joseph Licata
Dept. of Educational
Administration
Valdosta State College
Valdosta, Georgia 31601

Bibliography of Project R.O.M.E. Documents and Research Papers Related to the Development of The Georgia Principal Assessment System (GPAS)

Identification and Development of Competencies of Building Level Administrators of Thomas County, Georgia: A project report. Vol. I, Georgia Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, August, 1974.

Identification and Development of Competencies of Building Level Administrators of Thomas County, Georgia: A project report (APPENDICES). Vol. 2, Georgia Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, August, 1974.

Results Oriented Management in Education: Competencies for Building Level Administrators. Georgia Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, August, 1974.

A Handbook for Identifying and Developing Competencies of Building Level Administrators. Georgia Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, August, 1974.

The Assessment of Principal Competencies: System Design--Procedures--Field Test Results. Georgia Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, August, 1974.

Competencies for Building Level Administrators. Georgia Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, August, 1974.

The Verification and Validation of Principal Competencies and Performance Indicators: Assessment Design--Procedures--Instrumentation--Field Test Results. Vol. I, (Final Report), Georgia State Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, December, 1975.

The Verification and Validation of Principal Competencies and Performance Indicators: Data Appendices. Vol. 2, (Final Report), Georgia State Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, December, 1975.

The Verification and Validation of Principal Competencies and Performance Indicators: Instrument Appendices. Vol. 3, (Final Report), Georgia State Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, December, 1975.

Ellett, Chad D. The Continued Refinement and Development of the Georgia Principal Assessment System and Its Application to a Field-Based Training Program for Public School Principals: Assessment Design--Procedures--Instrumentation--Field Test Results. Vol. 1 (Final Report), Georgia State Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, October, 1976.

Ellett, Chad D. The Continued Refinement and Development of the Georgia Principal Assessment System and Its Application to a Field-Based Training Program for Public School Principals: Assessment Design--Procedures--Instrumentation--Field Test Results. Vol. 2 (Appendices), Georgia State Department of Education, Thomas County, Georgia, College of Education, University of Georgia, October, 1976.

* * * * * * * * * * * *